THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. II.] BOSTON, SEPTEMBER, 1861. [No. 9.

CHRIST AND HIS ANTICHRISTS.

BY JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

An Address to the Alumni of the Divinity School, Cambridge, July, 1861.

(Continued from our last.)

THE ANTICHRIST OF DOGMA.

THE first Antichrist developed in the Church of Christ was, as we have seen, the CHURCH itself, resolved into ceremony, ritual, form. The body of Christ, which consists of faithful men and women united around him, filled with his truth and love, doing his work, was degraded to a mere external worship. The minister (or servant) was changed into a priest. The worship of spirit and truth, for which the Father seeks, became a worship of time, place, person, ritual. Then came the re-action and reform, and the Antichrist was struck down.

The next great Antichrist which arose in the church was the DOGMA, claiming to be Christ, coming in his name, and saying, "I AM HE." The dogma which asks for faith in itself, instead of asking for faith in Christ, becomes an Antichrist. Every great doctrine of the church, no doubt, at first represented a vital truth. THE

DEITY OF CHRIST meant, at first, simply this: that those who see Christ, see not him, but his Father, — looking through him to God; that God's truth and God's love are fully incarnate in him. So of TOTAL DEPRAVITY and THE ATONEMENT: all meant something real. They were, at first, insights of the soul. These insights were put into formal statements, and so made into doctrines; and then men were asked to accept them. As inspirations, they had led the soul to God: so it was supposed, that, as dogmas, they would do the same. "This is Christianity," said the dogmatist. "Here is Christ, in this creed of ours. Only assent to it, and it will work like a charm. It will save your soul." So, at last, it was not expected of men to see the truth, but merely to assent to what others said about it. Conformity was required, not faith. The church had claimed to be Christ, and said it alone could save the soul; and now the creed came, and said that it was Christ, and that it alone could save the soul. But both the church and the creed, in making these claims, proved themselves to be, not Christ, but Antichrist. Salvation by Orthodoxy calls away the soul from Christ to itself, as much as salvation by the church did before.

As the church took the place of Christ in Romanism, so the dogma took the place of Christ in Protestantism. Protestants saw that the Church of Rome was Antichrist; but failed to see that their own system of belief, when made essential to salvation, was another Antichrist, more subtle, and therefore perhaps more dangerous, than the other.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me repeat, that I only call the Church of Rome, or any other church, an Antichrist, when it makes itself essential to the soul's salvation; and so I call no creed Antichrist till it makes the same idolatrous pretension. Not till they come *in the name of Christ*, saying, "I am he," do they become Antichrist.

Whenever, therefore, in the hands of any of its ministers, the Church of Rome forgets or omits this sacrilegious claim, and simply does its work for human souls, it becomes a part of the true body of Jesus Christ on earth; and whenever the dogma comes, not claiming to be accepted as infallible and vital truth, but offering its aid to human need so far as it can be honestly received, then it also becomes a medium through which Christ may visit the soul. When the church or when the creed exalts itself, it is abased; but, when it humbles itself, it is exalted.

If it is true, that an opinion about Christ is a different thing from Christ himself, then it is evident that to rely on the opinion for salvation is not the same thing as to rely upon Christ for salvation. Then the opinion calls away our faith from Christ. True as an opinion, or object of belief, it becomes false as an object of faith or reliance; and, if false, then, being a substitute for the true, it is Antichrist.

But is it not evident that trust in an opinion is one thing, trust in Christ quite another? Christ is not to the true believer an opinion, a belief, a theory, a creed: he is an inward life. The only true faith is faith in Christ born within us, the hope of glory. The living Christ, rooted in the heart, revealed by the Holy Spirit to the soul, is the real object of faith; not the dead opinion about him, formed by reflection in the region of the understanding, and held in the memory.

All experimental Christians have seen and admitted this distinction. "A string of opinions is no more Christian faith," said Wesley, "than a string of beads is Christian practice." Quotations to the same effect might be multiplied from writers in every section of the church. Even a low stage of spiritual life shows the difference between belief in a doctrine, and faith in a person. This distinction holds

even in regard to others whom we have not seen, and with whom we have no such spiritual intercourse as most Christians are satisfied we can have with Christ. I have faith in Milton, in Washington, in Franklin, in Fénélon. They are personally my guides, masters, friends. They influence me, through my faith in them, more than do others whom I have seen. Of them, as of Christ, I can say, "Whom, not having seen, I love; in whom, though now I see them not, yet, believing, I rejoice." But suppose I were to put my opinions of their character and mission into the form of articles: would assent to those articles be equivalent to faith in the men themselves? Surely not. My creed about Milton might be signed by many persons, who, accepting it intellectually, would yet not receive the influence from Milton that I do. The influence comes from Milton himself, as inwardly known, loved, and imitated.

The distinction above explained is, as I have said, commonly admitted; but it is not generally understood that we lose one influence when we accept the other in its place. When we look in one direction, we necessarily look away from every other. When we put our faith in opinions for our salvation, we cease to put our faith in Christ for our salvation. One thing is needful as an end, and one thing as means. The end of the commandment is human love: the means to that human love is the reception of the Divine Love, which flows into the world through the living mediation of Christ. Christ himself is the way, not Mr. Calvin's creed or Mr. Priestley's creed about Christ, — Christ himself, seen in the Gospels, or seen in the heart; seen in history, or seen in our own private experience; seen through the holy mediations of maternal love and Christian goodness; known through the inspired voices of sages, poets, preachers; but seen and known in some way as a personal influence of truth and love, leading our hearts to God.

Influence helps, but formulas hinder, the influx of God to the soul. "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing," said the Master himself. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," is asserted by Paul; and we have only been repeating this assertion in all we have now said, "THE LETTER KILLS." Can we say more than that?

It is for this reason that Jesus so carefully abstains from any formal or systematic statement of his opinions. He teaches, not doctrine, but truth. His word is seed. It is spirit and life. He utters it in vivid, poetic figures; in homely, household illustration; in penetrating, incisive antithesis; in suggestive aphorism; never in any systematic formula. He asks for faith in himself, never for any belief of statements about himself. He recognizes the divine law of mediation through personality. He knows (as Goethe says) that seed-truth must not be ground, or baked into a loaf. He demands the living consent of the soul, not the formal assent of the understanding. Men shall come up into heaven, and sit at his right hand, on the last day, who do not know intellectually that they have ever seen him, or done any thing for him. THE PURE IN HEART see God. God is seen by the heart more than by the intellect. It is the Spirit of God in the heart that quickens: the flesh of external formula profits nothing.

For what we have been saying, we claim no originality. Several sections of the Protestant Church have powerfully protested against this Antichrist of Orthodox Dogma. Eminent among them have been the Quakers, the Methodists, the Swedenborgians, the Unitarians, and the Transcendentalists. Each of these bodies, from its own standpoint, has attacked with successful energy the doctrine of salvation by Orthodoxy.

The Quakers (whose extraordinary movement in the seventeenth century anticipated the most advanced philo-

sophy, the most enlightened theology, the most radical moral reforms, and the most thorough re-organizing socialism, of the nineteenth) — the Quakers attacked Protestant Orthodoxy in their profound doctrine of the Inner Light. "The soul," they said, "was saved, not by what it believed intellectually, but by what it saw spiritually." — "Eternal life is to know God," says Barclay; "and God is only known by his Son; and the Son only known by the Spirit, which gives an inward sight of him."

This protest of the Quakers against the Dogma has been frequently observed; but it has not been so often noticed, that the great movement of Wesley was also a rising-up of the religious instincts against the two Antichrists of church and creed. John Wesley had himself been through all that religion of form, which we now call Puseyism, before he arrived at that vital experience which was the root of Methodism. At Oxford, and afterward in Georgia, he was a zealous Churchman, seeking to save his own soul by fidelity to all Church forms and Church obedience, by ascetic devotion, by self-sacrificing philanthropy, by fasting and prayer; but all brought him no peace. He repeated the experience of Paul the Pharisee, and of Luther the monk, striving for salvation by works, and ending with the same cry, "Wretched man that I am!" Thus, as Luther, through Stapfer, was led to Christ in simple faith, so Wesley, through the Moravian, was led to Christ in simple faith; and the great Methodist movement began when he passed from Puseyism and Orthodoxism, and became a childlike believer in the unpurchased gospel of Christian love and truth.

This fact, that, in the experience of Wesley, Puseyism preceded Methodism, is of great significance in determining the respective positions of these two systems to each other in the scale of the advancing church. Agassiz founds a

system of classification based upon embryonic development. He fixes the rank of a species of animals in the scale of being by noticing which organization precedes the other, and which is a subsequent development, in the same individual. If an embryo breathes by gills, and these gills afterward become replaced by lungs, he regards the organization by lungs as higher than the organization by gills. If the embryo lobster has the organization of a trilobite, he argues that the trilobite is a lower being in the scale of creation. Trilobites of one period become lobsters in a subsequent one. Now, if we can trace in Christian experience any similar progress, we may determine the respective order and rank of sects and systems. If the tendency of Christian experience is out of Catholicism into Protestantism, the Protestantism is the higher. If the tendency, again, is out of Puseyistic Protestantism into Methodistic, or from that of form to that of inward experience, then we may say that Methodism is higher than Puseyism, and an advance upon it. Now, the concurring experience of Paul, Luther, and Wesley, shows that they had exhausted the religion of form before they attained to that of inward experience: they passed from the law to grace, from works to faith. Paul passed from Jewish works to Christian faith, Luther from monkish Christian works to Protestant Christian faith, Wesley from High-Church-of-England works to Methodist Christian faith. The striking and important fact in the experience of Wesley is, that he thoroughly tried that system which we now call Puseyism, and found it wanting, before he passed into that other experience which made of him one of the great lights of the church, and one of the great benefactors of mankind. Methodism has its errors and defects, no doubt. We shall presently see that its tendency toward emotional religion is its peculiar danger. But it cannot be doubted by any

sagacious student of comparative Christian theology, that the Methodism of Wesley is one of the highest forms of Christianity yet attained in the church. We may, therefore, say that the conversions from Protestantism to Romanism, and from spiritual Christianity to formal Christianity, are but retrograde and sporadic movements, having no large significance. They indicate only eddies in the church, not the main current.

Swedenborg, again, has, from the basis of a spiritual insight, protested against the Antichrist of Orthodoxy. The profound mysticism of his soul, joined with a most healthy intellect, has given to us in his writings a system of rational spiritualism which no theologian can neglect, except to his own loss. The great value of it, I think, is that it lifts us above dogma into the light of the living facts and the permanent love of spirit. It is injured by the presence of Swedenborg's strong individualism, and is to be used rather as suggestion than as instruction; but, as suggestion, it is of great value. The re-action of his will against the dead Calvinism of the Scandinavian Church sometimes confuses his spiritual vision; but his spiritual insight was, perhaps, the most powerful vouchsafed to any man in these later days.

This Antichrist of Dogma also has seen its day. The horrid roar, which once shook the forest with terror, has dwindled in our time into a lugubrious cry. Orthodoxism now is obliged to concede, to compromise, and to be silent. It can no longer persecute, but must tolerate error even in its own high places. Let us rejoice that its reign is well nigh over; for so we are so much nearer to the coming of the Son of man.

Mr. Buckle, in his second volume, has drawn a vivid picture of the evils resulting to civilization from the Antichrist of Form in Catholic Spain, and the Antichrist of

Dogma in Calvinistic Scotland. It is an historic warning of the most important kind. Mr. Buckle writes as a pleader and advocate. He is the prosecuting officer of Positivism. He gathers his facts in the interest of that too material system. He is, therefore, to be read cautiously, and remembering this bias; but his light, being thrown on history from a new point, will illuminate much which has before been left in shadow.

Religious Emotionalism an Antichrist.

The next Antichrist is religious emotionalism, or the religion of fear and feeling.

With a large part of the Christian world, Christianity, religion, and piety are synonymous terms: only, Christianity is supposed to be a lower state of the soul than religion, and religion a lower state than piety. Piety is the culminating point to which we ascend through religion from Christianity. A man, it is thought, may be a Christian, in a low and common sense of the word, without being religious; and he may be a religious man, in an external way, without being pious. When he professes a belief in Christ and Orthodox Christianity, he is a Christian; when he goes forward from that point and devotes himself to religious duties, becomes a member of the church and a diligent attendant on religious meetings, reads his Bible daily, has family prayers, respects the Lord's Day, then he is religious; but when he goes still further, and encounters an experience of emotion, — being exercised by fear and hope, tormented by a sense of sin, and made happy by a feeling of forgiveness, and so comes at last into devout relations of prayer and praise to God, — he has ascended another step, and is pious. His salvation is now fully assured. Before, it was a little doubtful; but now it is quite certain.

Emotional piety is therefore, by many, considered to be a higher condition of the soul than Christianity or religion. An intelligent trust in the truths of Christianity, and an honest attempt to do God's will, are thought of less value in His eyes than an emotional experience passing through certain definite states of fear, hope, joy, and ecstatic emotion. That this is the theory of many, if not most, of the churches, there can be no question.

But I maintain that this emotional religion often becomes a substitute for Christianity. Men trust for salvation to present or past experiences of this sort, instead of trusting to the truth and love of God as seen in Christ. They ask concerning a man, "Is he pious?" meaning, "Has he passed through such and such a religious experience?" Men are taught to rely for their salvation, not upon the divine idea of Eternal Love shown to them in Christ, but upon some emotional experience of their own souls. Piety then becomes an Antichrist. It comes in the name of Jesus, saying, "I am Christ," and deceives many; teaching men to seek for life in themselves, rather than in life from God. It produces morbid self-analysis, sickly struggles after mere feeling, a selfish and personal religion, instead of the generous and broad religion of the gospel.

It is a mistake that piety is more than religion, and religion more than Christianity. Piety is the lowest stage of the religious life; Christianity, the highest. A man may be pious without being religious, and religious without being Christian. For one may experience religious emotion occasionally, without devoting his life to any religious object. A man may pray fervently every morning, and fervently every night, and yet go and spend the day in some purely worldly occupation having no relation to God or to duty. His ruling motion in life may be power, wealth, or reputation, knowledge, or pleasure.

Then he is not a religious man, though he is at times a pious man. A religious man is one who devotes his life to some high object, universal and unselfish.

Capt. Fifield, whose vessel was taken the other day by the privateer "Jefferson Davis," and who was kept prisoner on board that craft for a day or two, says that they had regular morning prayers. They were very possibly devout in their prayers; being pious, but not religious. The brigands of Italy, before they go out to rob and murder, pray fervently to the Virgin. There is no hypocrisy in it; their devotion is sincere: it is merely piety without religion. Walter Scott, in "Quentin Durward," describes the same psychological phenomenon in the case of Louis XI. of France, who prayed fervently to the Virgin for success in one little crime he was about to commit; promising her, if she let him succeed, it should be the last. This is another case of piety without religion.

It is also a fact, that there is more of piety usually in the lower forms of religion than in the higher. As we descend, religion becomes more emotional, — less intellectual, less practical. It goes down, out of the reason and out of the will, into the feelings. Consequently, there is less of emotional piety in the Protestant Church than in the Roman-Catholic; less in the Roman-Catholic Church than in the Mohammedan; less in Mohammedanism than in Buddhism; less in Buddhism than in Brahmanism. He who has been in Catholic countries, and has seen the churches thronged with worshippers on every festa; has seen the penitents kneeling at every shrine on every week-day; and who learns how many hours are devoted to prayer by the regular orders, and by all persons seeking to be religious, — knows well that there is more emotional piety in the Roman-Catholic Church than in the Protestant. Martin Luther observed the same fact. "At that time," says he in his "Table-talk," "my wife said

to me, 'Sir, how is it that in Popedom they pray so often and with such vehemency, but we are very cold and careless in our praying?'"

In Protestant countries, no one is seen praying: people are ashamed of their prayers. The majority of the community, perhaps, never really pray, except on great occasions and in trying exigencies; but, in Catholic countries, men, women, and children come and kneel on the floors of the churches, and are absorbed in their devotion: they go on their knees up the Scala Santa, repeating Paternosters and Ave Marias. Prayer has become an evident part of the occupation of a portion of the community. But, when you go into Mohammedan countries, prayer is a part of the business of the whole community. Five times a day, when the muezzin proclaims the hour of prayer from the minaret, all men fall prostrate on the ground, — the Turkish shopkeeper suspends his bargain, the Arab sailor falls on the deck of the Nile boat: for a moment, all the activity of life is suspended; every human being prays. In Pagan countries, devotion is carried still further. Rangoon, a city of Birmah, has a Buddhist pagoda two miles from the city, the road lined all the way with pagodas; and the chief business of the inhabitants is to pray at these shrines every day of every week. Two thousand worshippers are to be found every day prostrate in the chief pagoda, which is an enormous building, standing on the top of a hill, cut into terraces, gilt all over, with marble pavements, colossal lions, lofty pillars, enormous stone jars for ablution; but no bloody sacrifices, only offerings of rice, flowers, and green leaves, before the splendid images of Guatama. In Brahmanism, all of life is organized on devotion. Prayers are so numerous, that it would take years to become acquainted with them; and the object of all existence is devout absorption in the Infinite Being by asceticism and prayer. But this piety does not make the

Brahmin *better* than the Buddhist, nor the Buddhist better than the Mohammedan, nor the Mohammedan better than the Roman Catholic, nor the Roman Catholic better than the Protestant; and, if we must concede that there is more prayer and pious emotion among the Orthodox sects than among the Liberal sects, we may, perhaps, also say that there is not always more Christianity.

I wish we had more piety in Protestantism. I wish we were not ashamed to pray. I respect the Heathen for their simple and sincere devotion. I saw lately, in a school geography, a woodcut representing Heathen worship, and another representing Christian worship. The Heathen was represented prostrate on his face, on the ground, before his idol; the Christian, as sitting comfortably in his pew, listening to a sermon. But devout feeling is not Christianity; and when substituted for it, and made the condition of salvation, and test of the soul's state, it becomes an Antichrist. It comes in the name of Jesus, and says, "I am Christ, and I can save your soul." Then it becomes our duty to say that it is *not* Christ, and that it cannot save the soul. We must not forget, while we are admiring these manifestations of devotion in Paganism and elsewhere, who it was who rebuked those who prayed at the corners of the streets; who it was who said, "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet;" and who it was who rebuked the endless repetitions and many prayers of the Heathen and the Pharisee.

Thus we see that the external rites and outward formulas which Christ put aside in his temptation, and the visible religion and piety which he rejected, have come up again in the church, one after another, each saying in its turn, "I am Christ," and each deceiving many. But their day is passing. The true Christ is near at hand. "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipper shall

worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him." God is looking and waiting and seeking for true piety, — piety which is not emotion, but love; which is emancipated from form, delivered from the yoke of fear, and which is a spirit of power, of love, and of a sound mind.

Gentlemen and friends, Christian brothers, Alumni of this school of Christian truth, — I congratulate you on the work to which you are called. No Antichrist of church authority, of Orthodoxy, or of emotional religion, comes between your soul and the sight of Christ at his coming. Stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made you free, and be not subject again to any yoke of bondage, — not to creeds, not to churches, not to ceremonies, nor even to emotions. Let the dead bury their dead: go you, and preach the kingdom of God. Let your words be seeds of truth, to bear fruit hereafter, if not now. Look forward to the great day of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven, in an illumination of spiritual religion, in a widespread flow of brotherly love, in a simple trust in God's fatherly care. The day is sure to come, in which all churches, creeds, and parties shall be dissolved and swallowed up in his light of love. Labor for the coming of that day. We may not live to see it; though methinks its dawn is already lighting the mountain-tops. The advanced guard of many differing hosts are already meeting in the Valley of Decision.

Adopt for your maxim, then, the legend and device on the seal of John Quincy Adams, — an acorn striking root, with the motto, "Alteri sæculo," — "For the coming age."

Let us not pine for any fleshpots of Egypt; let us not yield to any poor re-action from Christ to Antichrist, like the foolish Galatians, bewitched by the hollow forms, empty of the best life of love.

As our brave brothers and friends to-day go gladly to fight for freedom and union in the State, so let us contend as steadfastly for freedom and union in the Church. Let us stand by our flag, — the white, blue, and red of Christianity, — the white faith, pure and simple; the hope, blue as the heavens to which it aspires; and the glowing red of a divine and human love. And as our late splendid visitor, who —

> "Fired the length of Ophiucus large
> In the Arctic sky, and from his horrid hair
> Shook pestilence and war," —

comes only occasionally, and soon disappears, while the gentle and regular planets spin on soft axle through their steadfast orbit, without haste or rest, attended with silver ring or sparkling satellites; so let us leave the fiery and ominous theologies to come and go, dreadful portents, shaking war on their way, while we circle evermore around God, seen in Christ, as the sun of our system, and the light of our souls.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ASSOCIATION.

There is reason to believe that our societies generally wish to have, from time to time, a distinct and complete statement of the contributions made to the funds of the American Unitarian Association. There are many reasons why such statements should be made. Societies need to be reminded, if they have not made a contribution. Societies which have made contributions ought to have their gifts fully acknowledged. The zeal of one society ought to provoke another to good works.

We have therefore made out, with some care, a full statement of all the money given, *for all objects*, to the

American Unitarian Association, by each society in the denomination. We have selected for this purpose the last year, of which we have a full report, — from January, 1860, to January, 1861.

It will be seen from this statement, that a very large number of the parishes contributed *nothing* to the missionary funds of the Association during this year; that a considerable number gave very small donations; and that none of our societies gave what may be called a large donation.

While many societies in the Orthodox sects give their thousands yearly to the Board of Foreign Missions, and other thousands to the Tract Society and Education Society and Home-Mission Society, our churches, many of which are as wealthy as these, give only their hundreds, or give nothing.

Why is this? Why, for example, — to make the point more distinct, — should the Old South Church or Dr. N. Adams's Church give $4,000 or $5,000 per annum to the A. B. F. M., and King's Chapel or Brattle Square give *nothing* to our Association?

The answer must be one of these three: —

Our societies do not believe in missionary action;

Or else, believing in missionary action, they do not believe in the American Unitarian Association as a medium of that action;

Or else, having a latent belief in missions, and also in the American Unitarian Association, they have not had their attention properly called to the subject, and therefore do not realize what they can and ought to do in the matter.

So far as the first obstacle intervenes, the Association can do nothing. It is for the pastors of the churches respectively to instruct their members in what they owe to the cause of Christian truth and Christian righteousness; it is

for the pastors to make the people comprehend their duties in relation to Christ's coming and his kingdom.

So far as the second objection prevails (viz., a want of confidence in the American Unitarian Association as the medium of their action), we can only show the churches our list of officers, and ask them, if dissatisfied, to remove and replace them by others in whom they have more confidence. The American Unitarian Association is here, a machine already made, which you can use as you will. If you want it altered, alter it; but use it, — at all events, *use it.*

But if the reason why more funds are not contributed is thoughtlessness or ignorance in the churches, we may do something to remove *this* obstacle by such statements as we here make. We can show the societies what we want to do, and how little we are able to do it. We can show them how little they are doing, and ask them to do more. We can beg them to be regular and systematic in their donations.

We have some two hundred and fifty societies in our denomination. Of these, perhaps fifty are either in a dying or dead condition, or are unable from other causes to contribute to our funds. This leaves two hundred societies to whom we may look. If each of these societies should contribute regularly to our funds, — say, an average of $100, — we should immediately have from this source $20,000. But there are, in every society, individuals who might give $100. Some of our rich city societies contain fifty persons who might give each $1,000. There are single societies which could give, and which ought to give, $50,000 a year for missionary objects; yes, and which, if they live long enough, *will* give that amount. But, for the present, we may be contented if we can induce two hundred of our societies to agree to give every year *some-*

thing, be it more or less, for missionary objects. The average given in 1860, by the societies which then gave, was, it will be seen, $67 each. If this were increased to an average of $75 each, and two hundred societies were to give it regularly, we should have an income, from this source, of $15,000.

Now, what could we do with $15,000?

1. We could devote $5,000 per annum to the India Mission. This would enable us to put it on a fine foundation, to maintain the school with two hundred native pupils and a corps of teachers, and to circulate the works of Channing and of like minds throughout all India.

2. We could devote $5,000 more per annum to Home Missions. This would enable us to have a missionary in nearly every State of the Union, and to circulate our tracts and books wherever they are called for.

3. We could increase the circulation of the "Monthly Journal" by advertising, and cause it to go into a multitude of places where it is not known. We could send our books and our pamphlets in all directions, and educate for the ministry such men as ought to be aided. We could aid societies to go forward and maintain worship, and revive the things which are about to perish. Is it not worth while to try to do all this?

The following churches contributed nothing, in 1860, to the funds of the American Unitarian Association, either by donation, or subscription to the "Monthly," or any other form: —

Albany, N.Y.
Alton, Ill.
North Andover.
Athol.
Austinburg.
Bedford.
Bernardston.
Bloomington, Ill.
Bolton.
First Church, Boston.
King's Chapel, Boston.
Brattle Street, Boston.
New North, Boston.
Bulfinch Street, Boston.
Twelfth Congregational, Boston.
Broadway, South Boston.
Church of the Unity, Boston.
Braintree.

Brewster.
Cambridge, Allen Street.
Charleston, S.C.
Chelmsford.
Chelsea.
First Church, Cincinnati.
Second Church, Cincinnati.
Detroit, Mich.
Dighton.
Dixon, Ill.
Dover.
Duxbury.
North Easton.
Feltville, N.J.
Fitzwilliam, N.H.
Fond du Lac, Wis.
Geneva, Ill.
Gloucester.
Groton Junction.
Hartford, Conn.
Harvard.
Haverhill.
Hillsborough, Ill.
South Hingham.
Hubbardston.
Jersey City.
Kalamazoo.
Keokuk.
Lawrence.
Lawrence, Kan.
East Lexington.
Lincoln.
Lockport, Ill.
Lynn.
Madison, Wis.
Malden.
Manchester, N.H.
Marshfield.
Meadville, Pa.
Medford.
Mendon.
Milwaukee, Wis.
Montague.
Nantucket.
Nashua, N.H.
South Natick.
New Salem.
Newtonville.
Third Society in New York.
Northampton,
Northumberland.
Norton.
Peoria, Ill.
Perry, Me.
Pittsburg.
Quincy, Mass.
Quincy, Ill.
Randolph.
Raynham.
Richmond, N.H.
Rochester, N.Y.
Rowe.
Saco.
East Church in Salem.
Sandwich.
San Francisco.
Scituate.
South Scituate.
Sharon.
Shirley.
Standish, Me.
Stoneham.
St. Paul, Minn.
Toledo, O.
Townsend.
Trenton, N.Y.
Troy.
Tyngsborough.
Upton.
Vernon, N.Y.
Walpole.
Warwick.
Washington, D.C.
Westborough.
Weston.
Williamsburg, N.Y.
Wilton, N.H.
Winchendon.
Windsor.
Woburn.
Yonkers.

In the year extending from Jan. 1, 1860, to Jan. 1, 1861, these societies, amounting to *one hundred and nine* in number, contributed *nothing* to the funds of the Association.

It should be said, it is true, that some of the churches in this list are only nominally in existence; having suspended their services and meetings. Some of them may have given

largely during the year to missionary objects, virtually the same as those of the Association. Some others may have given liberally to the Association in 1859 or in 1861. Thus the society in San Francisco is put down in this list as giving nothing in 1860; but in May, 1861, it sent $500 to the Association. Alton, Cincinnati, Manchester, Meadville, Nashua, N.H., Saco, and perhaps others, contributed in 1859 to the Association. Some of these societies may, therefore, have had reasons for not giving during this particular period. Nevertheless, it remains a very discouraging fact, that, out of two hundred and fifty societies, one hundred and nine should have given nothing during a whole year.

Again: of the societies which contributed to the Association, in 1860, the following gave sums less than $25: —

Ashby	$11.61	Lancaster, N.H.	$10.00
Barnstable	16.00	Leicester	10.00
Barre	8.00	Lowell (Second)	16.00
Bath, Me.	17.00	Lunenburg	10.00
Billerica	16.00	Mansfield	4.00
Brattleborough, Vt.	17.00	Marietta, O.	20.00
West Bridgewater	16.00	Marlborough	21.00
Brookfield	10.00	New Orleans	10.00
Brunswick, Me.	6.00	West Newton	11.00
Calais, Me.	4.00	Northborough	23.00
Lee Street, Cambridge	7.00	North Chelsea	13.00
West Cambridge	15.00	Northfield	20.00
Chicago	10.00	Pembroke	5.00
Chicago (Second)	12.00	Pepperell	15.00
Chicopee	2.00	Philadelphia (Second)	11.00
Clinton	6.00	Plymouth	2.00
Deerfield	11.00	Portland, Me.	15.00
Dorchester (Second)	15.00	Rockford, Ill.	19.00
Dorchester (Fourth)	24.00	Stowe	7.00
Dover, N.H.	6.00	Sudbury	8.00
Exeter	17.00	Uxbridge	23.33
Fairhaven	17.00	Walpole, N.H.	7.00
Fall River	18.00	Waltham	2.00
Hallowell	10.00	Ware	3.00
Hampton Falls	24.00	Watertown	2.00
Hingham (Third)	8.00	Wayland	11.00
Kingston	7.00	Westford	11.46
Lancaster	20.00		

Fifty-five churches, therefore, contributed each less than $25. The total amount of these contributions was $660.40. The average for each society was $12.

The following churches contributed, in 1860, $25 and upwards, but less than $50:—

Baltimore, Md.	$29.00	Kennebunk, Me.	$42.00
Second Church, Baltimore	27.00	Lexington	25.30
Belmont	30.00	Marblehead	41.00
East Bridgewater	44.13	All Souls, N.Y.	44.00
Brighton	30.00	New Brunswick, N.J.	26.00
Canton	35.00	Peterborough, N.H.	44.11
Cohasset	26.00	Petersham	37.00
Concord, N.H.	27.48	Roxbury (First)	43.00
Dedham	27.00	West Roxbury	25.00
West Dedham	25.35	Salem (First)	30.00
Easton	30.00	Barton Square, Salem	49.00
Eastport	47.00	Somerville	29.00
Grafton	41.75	Sterling	45.00
Hingham (First)	45.00	Worcester (Second Society)	33.00

Twenty-eight societies, therefore, contributed during the year more than $25, but less than $50. The total amount of all their contributions was $978.12. The average for each society was $35.

The following churches contributed, in 1860, $50 and upwards, but less than $100:—

Augusta, Me.	$84.00	Groton	$95.00
Belfast, Me.	69.00	Leominster	50.00
Beverly	90.50	Littleton	50.00
Hollis Street, Boston	75.00	Louisville, Ky.	50.00
Hawes Place, Boston	56.13	Medfield	57.00
East Boston	50.00	Montreal, C.W.	50.00
Brooklyn, N.Y.	71.28	Newburyport	73.00
Second Church, Brooklyn	83.00	Portland (Second Society)	84.00
Buffalo, N.Y.	50.00	Providence (2d Society)	92.00
Burlington, Vt.	50.00	St. Louis, Mo.	61.73
East Cambridge	57.00	North Church, Salem	97.40
Danvers	57.00	Sherborn	51.00
Dorchester (First)	69.00	Syracuse, N.Y.	50.00
Dorchester (Third)	55.00	Templeton	60.00
Framingham	90.00	Thomaston, Me.	60.00

Thirty societies, therefore, contributed more than $50, and less than $100. The total amount of their contributions was $2,018.04. The average amount for each society was $61.

The following churches contributed, in 1860, more than $100, but less than $500:—

Bangor, Me.	$160.00	Milton	$114.00
Second Church, Boston	217.36	New Bedford	247.00
New South, Boston	145.35	Newport, R.I.	116.00
West Church, Boston	270.64	Newton Corner	128.00
Church of Disciples	200.00	New York (Church of the Messiah)	106.00
Bridgewater	101.00	Philadelphia (First)	167.00
Brookline	330.00	Portsmouth, N.H.	102.96
Cambridge	176.00	Providence, R.I.	233.15
Cambridgeport	131.00	Roxbury, Mt. Pleasant	136.00
Charlestown	120.00	Jamaica Plain	207.71
Concord, Mass.	138.00	Staten Island, N.Y.	162.00
Fitchburg	110.63	Taunton	150.00
Keene, N.H.	221.00	Worcester	148.00
Lowell (First)	102.00		

Only the following churches contributed, in 1860, more than $500 to the funds of the Association: —

Federal Street, Boston	$665.00
South Congregational, Boston	521.00
Springfield	582.52

Nineteen societies, therefore, contributed more than $100, and less than $200; seven societies contributed more than $200, and less than $300; one society, more than $300, and less than $400; two societies, more than $500, and less than $600; one society, more than $600.

These results may be tabulated as follows: —

Number of Societies.	How much given in 1860.	Total.	Average.
109	Gave nothing.		
55	Gave less than $25.00	$660.40	$12.00
28	" " " 50.00	978.12	35.00
30	" " " 100.00	2,018.04	61.00
19	" " " 200.00	2,513.94	133.00
7	" " " 300.00	1,596.82	228.00
1	" " " 400.00	330.00	330.00
2	" " " 600.00	1,109.52	554.00
1	" " " 700.00	665.00	665.00
252		$9,871.84	$67.00

Let us hope that this table may rouse many to the consideration of their remissness and their duties, and that a similar statement ten years hence may show ten times the amount of donations to the cause of Christ through this ministration.

INDIA MISSION.

Letter from Gangooly.

Our Mission House, Calcutta,
April 8, 1861.

My dear Sir, — Believing this will reach you at or before the time when our Unitarian Convention meets, I write a few words of Christian greeting to the brethren and sisters. Will you be kind enough to read it to them, when you find an opportunity? and I feel quite sure that they will be pleased to hear from me, whom they have taken so much interest in.

To the Members of the Unitarian Convention.

Dear Brethren and Sisters in Christ, — Grace, peace, and joy from Him who is the fountain of all bliss, rest upon you! May the spirit of Christ sanctify you!

From my home in this far East, my heart visits you hourly; yea, always. The happy days I have spent among you, the sweet recollections of love and affection you have shown me, are ever fresh in my mind. I was, in your midst, not as a stranger, but as a brother, a friend, and a fellow-servant; and the tender treatments bestowed upon me are recorded in the book of the Lamb.

You will naturally desire to hear of my reception at home, and of my doings here.

On my arrival at home, a low-caste woman ran in, crying, "Joguth!" and I immediately found myself encircled by the tender arms of my dear mother. The superstition, mighty as it was, gave way to the maternal love. My mother would not let me come out of the house; said she had not seen me for three years, therefore she would keep me near her for years to come, and feed me with the food

I was fond of. She had laid by my plates, tumblers, &c., with a *firm* conviction that her gods would bring me once more to her arms; so she brought them out, and made me eat my meals on them. During my absence, she never allowed any one to use the best cocoanuts; and now she wishes to make me cakes and pies of them. But, alas! her loving, affectionate heart could not find sphere to exercise itself. The Brahmins outcast her and her family for admitting her Christian son to the dining-room. I have left her in her village in distress and despair, and am trying to rescue *her* from the outcast life. The Brahmins are willing to take her back, provided she makes the penances, gives them some money, and will not allow me to take *my meals* at home. God bless her and her ignorant oppressor, is my prayer.

I teach three hours daily in the school connected with our Mission, and find it a very sacred and pleasant task. It brings me scores of little children; young men, with their hearts full of affection; and I put the seeds of life therein. May God give increase while we plant and water!

Besides, I receive visitors in my room, and occasionally visit them in theirs. Yesterday (Sunday, 7th April) I called upon a very learned young man in the afternoon, and had a very interesting conversation upon things pertaining to the regeneration of India. This is the beginning of my work; and I hope God will prosper me for his mercy's sake. May he enable me to stand, live, and work so faithfully and earnestly, that you may realize the great hopes you have put in me!

Our Mission is doing well, as far as I can see. The inquirers are always with us. The school is a thriving one, and will do great good. Be not despaired, brethren, in your minds. Let us work for God's sake wherever we can, and the blessing will be ours.

You do your part, brethren; and, while we do ours, send us your sympathy, your help, and thereby enable us to work effectually. That your gatherings may be attended with success, and your hearts and homes be visited with the blessings of God, is the prayer of your friend and brother,

J. C. GANGOOLY.

UNITARIAN CHAPLAINS.

THE following charming little paragraph is copied into the "Boston Recorder" from the "Presbyterian;" and is now doubtless going the rounds of those "religious" papers, whose religion consists in hating their neighbor, and coveting their neighbor's influence: —

CHAPLAINS FOR THE ARMY.

There is a commendable zeal among us to see the soldiers that have gone forth to fight our battles supplied with the means of religious instruction; but a chaplain earnestly devoted to their spiritual interests is the great desideratum. Yet a large portion of the regiments that have gone forth from New England are of the class described in the following, from the "Presbyterian:" —

"A clerical gentleman, who recently spent a couple of days in visiting the camps in and around Washington City, reports the following conversation as having taken place between a soldier of the Maine regiment, encamped at Kalorama, and himself; which we think altogether too good to be lost: —

"'Have you a chaplain in your regiment?'

"'We have, sir.'

"'Of what denomination is he?'

"(After a pause,) 'I can't remember the name, sir.'

"'Is he a Congregationalist?'

"'No: that's not the name.'

"'A Baptist?'

"'No: he is not a Baptist.' (Then, after pondering deeply for a moment, he added, with a most ingenuous and delightful simplicity,) 'What do you call those people that don't have no experience of religion, but just preach?'

"'Oh, ay! — is it Unitarian?'

"(Instantly and eagerly,) 'Yes: that's it, — Unitarian. I know he's a Unitarian, from the way he preaches.'"

The chaplains are appointed by the officers of the regiment, and, of course, according to their religious or irreligious leanings; and it has so happened, that the religious element among the soldiers, however great it may be, has not been considered in these appointments. The case here reported shows it: there is but the smallest sprinkling of Unitarianism in the State of Maine, and yet this Maine regiment has a Unitarian chaplain. Much of the same want of proportion has obtained in the Massachusetts appointments. There is no remedy for this; but the case requires that so much the more pains should be taken, by other means, to bring religious influences to bear on the soldiers.

The assumptions and insinuations in this "pious" paragraph are these: —

1. Unitarian chaplains have no experience of religion. This must be so; since a soldier testifies to it, who knows them intimately, though he cannot by his utmost effort remember the name of the denomination. He is considered good authority about the general character of ministers in a sect of whose very name he is helplessly ignorant.

2. The soldier, who does not know the name of the denomination, knows that a man belongs to the denomination, from his peculiar manner of preaching. This peculiar manner consists in "just preaching." Hence it would seem to follow, in the opinion of this clerical retailer of camp-gossip, that "experience of religion" is one thing, and "just preaching" another thing, inconsistent therewith.

3. That the chaplain of a regiment has no experience

of religion, is, in the opinion of the "religious newspapers," "altogether too good to be lost." Hence we see that the delight of these newspapers in slandering their neighbors far exceeds any sorrow they might feel in the soldiers having Unitarian chaplains.

The "Recorder" is perplexed and grieved because Unitarians have more than their share of the chaplaincies. The reason, however, may be, not that colonels like irreligious chaplains, but that Unitarians make good chaplains. This fact belongs to a group of facts of the same kind. Unitarians, it is complained, have far more than their numerical proportion of chaplains in the present war. It is true that they have. It is also true that they have, and have had, more than their proportion of senators and members of Congress, of judges, of presidents, and members of the Cabinet. They have more than their proportion of colonels and captains and other officers. They have more than their proportion of historians, poets, orators, professors of science, eminent writers. Of the eight great historians of America, enumerated by Mr. Everett on Commencement Day, six at least — Prescott, Sparks, Palfrey, Bancroft, Motley, Hildreth — are Unitarians: this we confess to be an outrageous monopoly; it is far more than our share. Of the great American poets, in like manner, we have Bryant, Longfellow, Lowell, Emerson, Holmes: which again involves the same "want of proportion;" it is more than our share. But what can be done about it? We must say, as the "Recorder" says of the chaplains, "There is no remedy for this."

The fact is, that Unitarians make good chaplains, and are therefore appointed. Their preaching is practical, and not doctrinal; their spirit is commonly friendly and kindly; they have good sense, and are usually well educated. They go among the soldiers like friends, without priestly arrogance or orthodox sanctimoniousness. The

best chaplains appointed from other sects are those who are most like Unitarians in these respects. Colonels know what they want in a chaplain, much better than is known by the "religious newspapers." They want sensible, practical, unpretending men, who are conscientious and faithful; who are not narrow bigots nor formalists; who will promote temperance, good humor, obedience, and healthful habits, among the men. This is justly considered more important than being sound on the Five Points of Calvin.

Our Unitarian chaplains — like Mr. Babbage of the Massachusetts Sixth, Mr. Woodbury of the Rhode-Island Second, Mr. Cudworth, Mr. Arthur B. Fuller, Mr. Barker, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Staples, Mr. Scandlin, and perhaps others — are all men of the sort we have described: they are, therefore, beloved by their officers and by the soldiers. We have Orthodox and Episcopal chaplains of the same kind, — most excellent and admirable men, who will never preach about the Trinity or total depravity to soldiers who need to hear about righteousness, temperance, and that judgment which comes in this world as well as in the next upon all wrong-doing. Of these, too, no less than of Unitarian chaplains, it may be said that they "just preach." They have nothing of the solemn formality supposed by many to belong to the pulpit, nor the dulness consecrated to the sermon. They preach about actual facts, and the things which belong to the comfort and the virtue of the soldiers. We are delighted to believe that most of the chaplains, of all sects, are open to the charge of the religious newspapers, and would, in their opinion, be without religious experience. The "Boston Recorder" may therefore, as always, stand apart, and thank God that it is not like this Unitarian, who "just preaches" out of good sense and a good heart: we, on our part, thank God that most of the Orthodox chaplains do the same.

THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.

The following communication, received some little time since, has suggested to us the propriety of a few remarks on this subject.

When a Trinitarian becomes a Unitarian, he is very apt to commence with Arianism. Having regarded Jesus as being "very God," he cannot immediately believe in him as only a man appointed by God to be Prince and Saviour. He therefore regards him as something less than God, but more than man. He conceives of him as the great archangel, — above all other creatures, but yet a creature; made before all worlds, but yet made; pre-existent, but pre-existent by the divine appointment. This, for a time, seems a satisfactory view; but, after a time, some difficulties arise in regard to it. For example: —

This view, instead of simplifying our idea of Christ, complicates and confuses it. For this being, made superior to angels and before all worlds, could not have been, in any usual sense, a human being. He was something above man, but below God, in nature and rank. But, according to the Scripture, Jesus was evidently a man too; for the New Testament speaks unequivocally on this point, and calls him a man, made in all points like his brethren. He therefore had a human nature, and a nature superior to human nature; and, besides this, he was filled with a divine nature. He therefore had *three* natures, instead of two or one. But this gives us a very confused view of his personality.

Such a pre-existence before all worlds must have modified very much his human experience. If he retained the memory of his former state, and the conscious-

ness of his past supremacy, he led a life wholly different from ours. His "increasing in wisdom" was an illusion; his being "tempted in all respects as we" was an impossibility. If one of us, at the close of his life, should begin it again in the form of a little child, but retaining all his past knowledge and acquired experience, he would not really be a little child, nor have the experience of a little child. Nor could Jesus really be a man, nor pass through a human life, if he brought with him into the human body the memory and consciousness of such a previous superhuman career.

Nothing is gained for experimental Christianity by a belief in the pre-existence of Jesus. There is no added reverence created by length of years. We do not respect Adam more than Moses, because Adam has lived so much longer than Moses. Aurelius Antoninus has lived longer than Alfred; but we do not esteem him more on that account. If God created Christ a hundred thousand years ago, instead of two thousand years ago, this does not increase at all the honor in which we hold him. Nor does it add any thing to his authority. That authority comes from his union with God, his perfect truth, his clear sight of all spiritual laws, his absolute superiority to sin and evil. It is his oneness with God, not his pre-angelic existence, which gives him real dignity and power.

If Christ existed before all worlds, but lost the consciousness and memory of his previous existence when he entered the human body, then it is just the same as if he had not pre-existed. Pre-existence, in this view, becomes insignificant and unimportant. We may all of us have pre-existed in this way, and it is not improbable that we really have so existed; but it is a fact without value as regards our earthly experience.

The letter to which we have referred is as follows: —

PORTSMOUTH, July 3.

DEAR FRIEND, — Will you be so kind as to give me an exposition of those passages of Scripture, which, by many Unitarians, are regarded as implying the pre-existence of Christ?

I have interpreted them as such until recently; but have been led to feel there are many difficulties, in this view, — practical difficulties, — in the way of receiving Christ as *our* example, "tried in all points as *we* are." On the other hand, the view which regards Christ as a new creation, — a perfect, divine *man*, — *filled* with the Holy Spirit, seems to be contradicted by his own words. How are they to be interpreted, especially the following? — "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up *where he was before?*" — "Glorify Thou me with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." — "He that cometh from heaven is above all." — "I came down from heaven." — "Before Abraham was, I am." Also those passages in the Epistles which imply the same thought. I know it is usual to interpret such as implying his existence in the divine counsels from all eternity; but this exposition does not satisfy me, nor does it seem to exhaust the true meaning of the Saviour's words.

Did the apostle JOHN thus receive them? Or is there any fuller meaning attached to them by the majority of Unitarians than this?

As a teacher, I feel the need of clear and definite views to impart to others; and, as a sincere seeker after truth, I have asked your aid in my inquiries. Pardon me if I am intruding upon your time; but any new light upon these themes, any view that shall bring Christ nearer to me, a living reality, will be most gratefully received, so far as it accords with his own teachings. Mental perplexity, I too well know, is unfavorable to the true spiritual life and progress; and most gladly would I be free from it, and see and know the simple truth.

The texts referred to in the above letter are these: —

1. John iii. 31: "He that cometh from above is above all."

2. John vi. 38: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me."

3. John vi. 62: "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?"

4. John viii. 58: "Before Abraham was, I am."

5. John xvii. 5: "The glory I had with Thee before the world was."

6. Col. i. 16: "By Him were all things created," &c. Also Col. iii. 10; Eph. ii. 10, iii. 9, iv. 24, &c.

Remarks. — To come "from above" does not imply or intend, in Scripture, a physical descent in space, but a moral and spiritual revelation. To say that one is "from above," means that he is in communion with God inwardly, and that his words and acts are expressive of that communion. Thus, John viii. 23, when Jesus says, "Ye are from beneath, I am from above," he did not mean that the Jews had come up physically from a lower world, or that he had come down physically from a higher: but he meant that *their* spirit was diabolical; *his*, angelical. The same contrast is in verses 38 and 44. He speaks of the Jews as coming from the Devil, being of the Devil, and having seen things with the Devil, just as he speaks of himself as having seen things with God.

How Jesus "came down from heaven" will appear by considering John iii. 13: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, — even the Son of man who is in heaven." From this it appears that Jesus *came from heaven, yet still continued in heaven.* This plainly means that he was interiorly in communion with God, while externally he was manifesting God to others: therefore it must be understood spiritually, and not naturally. In no natural sense did Jesus come out of heaven, but in the sense to which he refers, — John vi. 63: "The spirit quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." The common and natural view of Christ, as having come down in some outward way from an outward heaven, does

us no good: it "profits nothing." But the other view of Christ, being in living communion with God, and uttering himself out of that vital union, "quickens" the mind and heart.

When Jesus says, "Does this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" he means, "Are your prejudices hurt by what I have said? How, then, can you comprehend me in my high communion with Universal Truth, by which I rise above all the limitations of Judaism, and overlook all formal religion, and commune with God in spirit?" When Jesus says to Nathanael, "Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man," he referred to no outward vision, but to an inward sight of the revelations made to Christ.

It will be noticed that Jesus, in this relation, chooses the phrase "Son of man;" indicating that it is in his *human* character that he ascends where he was before, &c. This confutes the notion of its referring to any superhuman nature of Christ.

Jesus said, "Before Abraham was, I am;" in order to explain how Abraham could *see his day* (John viii. 56). But the fact of his pre-existence, though it might have enabled Abraham to see *him*, could not have enabled Abraham to see "*his day;*" that is, his coming as the Messiah. This could only have been seen prophetically by Abraham; and therefore Christ must have meant that he existed as the Messiah in the fore-ordination of God, in the time of Abraham.

Paul tells the Ephesians that God had chosen them in Christ "before the foundation of the world;" but he did not mean that they *pre-existed* at that time. So, when Christ speaks of the "glory he had with God before the world was," he speaks of having had it in the divine pur-

pose; for he speaks afterward of giving the same glory to his disciples (John xvii. 5, 22, 24).

The texts which seem to ascribe the work of creation to Christ are much more difficult to explain than those we have considered. But, the more one reads them in their connection, the more impossible it becomes to suppose them to refer to a physical creation. All indicate the new creation of which Christians are new creatures. We have not room here to discuss this point, and must therefore pass it by. Enough that the creation of the outward universe by Christ does not belong to the "Analogy of Faith." It stands in no vital connection with Christ's work or office. His office is, not to create, but to renew. God is the Creator; Christ, the Redeemer; the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier.

PASSAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT EXPLAINED.

"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." — 1 Cor. xi. 29.

There is hardly another text in the Bible that has done so much mischief as this. It has done much mischief positively, by giving a false idea of the Lord's Supper, and so keeping men away from it; and more mischief negatively, by preventing them from seeing the grand and lovely idea enshrined in that great sacrament. A false translation and a false interpretation have not only concealed the apostolic meaning, but have reversed it, — perverted it to a point-blank contradiction of itself. It has made Paul deny what he meant to say, and say what

he meant to deny. Terrible is the evil produced by such perversions of Scripture. A lie goes abroad in the panoply of truth; the gospel of Satan is preached with the authority of a divine inspiration; and the holy word of Christ is turned into an engine of falsehood and evil.

Now, in this passage, it happens that there are three falsehoods twisted into one triple cord of error. The common interpretation commits a threefold mistake. It mistakes the meaning of "*eating and drinking unworthily;*" it mistakes the meaning of "*the Lord's body;*" and it mistakes the meaning of the word mistranslated "*damnation.*" This I shall endeavor now to prove, so that we need not be in any doubt concerning it. I think it can be clearly shown how the passage has been perverted, and what it really means.

What is the common notion of the passage? How is it usually understood? Something in this way: That this act of communion — the partaking of bread and wine in memory of Christ — has something especially sacred and awful about it; that it is something which requires a special preparation, — more than our daily prayers, more than our Sunday worship; that it is an act no one ought to perform, except he be conscious of a peculiar depth of Christian faith and piety; that common Christians ought not to venture on it, but only uncommonly good Christians; and that if one partakes of it, who is not properly fitted by a general and a special preparation, he encounters some great risk of offending God and Christ, — something which is called "damnation," and which means the anger of God expressed hereafter in future punishment.

Now, this understanding of the passage is not only a misunderstanding, but it perverts a beautiful Christian act into a superstition. It frightens away the timid, the modest, the humble, from the table of Jesus; and, when at

last they come, they come as to some awful and mysterious sacrament; they sit in mute solemnity; and they go away with no definite idea of why they met, or what they have gained by so meeting. I do not say that no good comes even thus; I think the seriousness and concentration of mind thus produced is good: but infinitely *less* good comes than if a right notion of this *breaking of bread* prevailed.

The point of departure is the phrase, "*the Lord's body.*" Those who eat and drink unworthily do so because they "do not discern the Lord's body." What, then, does this mean? A Roman Catholic has no difficulty in replying. It means the real flesh and blood of Christ, mystically present by a transubstantiation of the elements. The substance of the bread and wine is miraculously transformed into the substance of Christ's body and blood. The form of the bread and wine remains; but the substance is changed. That is *transubstantiation*, — change of substance. What particular advantage we have from thus eating Christ's flesh and blood, he does not say: that is a mystery. To be sure, the Bible tells us that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and that which comes "of flesh is flesh." Paul declares, that "if he had known Christ after the flesh, yet that now he should know him no more," and that "he has no confidence in the flesh." Nevertheless, if the meaning of the Roman Catholic be not a very rational or Christian one, it is at least distinct. But what does the Protestant understand by "discerning the Lord's body" in the Supper? He and the Catholic agree in thinking that the "*bread and wine*" are referred to here; only he differs from the Catholic in thinking the bread and wine only the emblems of the Lord's body, and the body, again, the sign of his death: and so "not to discern it" means, not to think about Christ, about his death and atoning sufferings.

The Roman Catholic, therefore, has a distinct but irrational idea; the Protestant, an *in*distinct but rational one: and both fail of the true meaning of the Lord's body.

According to Paul, the Lord's body means the church. The Christian community — this seems to be his idea — now occupies the place of a body of which Christ is the spirit. The church is a corporation; Christ, its soul. Every individual is a member of this body, a limb of it, — a hand, foot, eye, ear, according to his capacity. This being so, united harmonious action is the sign of the body being in health; and to withdraw from the rest, to ignore the fact of this corporate relation, is "not to discern the Lord's body." Not to sympathize, and not to co-operate with our fellow-disciples in the work of Christianity, is the evil which he describes here.

That, by the Pauline usage, the body of Christ means the church, we will now proceed to show.

Rom. xii. 4: "We, being many, are one body in Christ, and members of each other."

1 Cor. vi. 15: "Your bodies are the members of Christ."

1 Cor. x. 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? *For we, being many, are one bread and one body;* for we are all partakers of that one bread."

1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27: "Body one, many members; so is Christ.

"By one spirit, all baptized *into one body.*

"Now, *ye are the body of Christ,* and members in particular."

Eph. i. 23: "God has made Christ to be head over all things in his church, *which is his body,* the fulness of Him who filleth all in all."

Eph. ii. 16: "Christ might reconcile both (Jew and Gentile) *in one body* to God by the cross."

Eph. iv. 12: "He gave us apostles and prophets, pastors and teachers, &c., for the perfecting of saints, for the work of ministry, for the edifying the *body of Christ*."

Eph. iv. 15, 16: "From whom the whole body," &c.

Eph. v. 23: "Christ, Head of the church, and *Saviour of the body*."

Eph. v. 29: "No man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church. For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. This is a great mystery; but I speak of Christ and his church."

Col. i. 18: "He is the head of the body, the church."

Col. ii. 17: "Shadow of things to come; but the body, Christ."

Col. ii. 19: "Holding the head, from which all the body, by joints," &c.

From these passages, it becomes clear that the Apostle Paul was accustomed to consider the church a community of Christians, as the *body of Christ*, and to call it so: not once, but often; not in one epistle, but several; not at one period of life, but at distances of years. His idea, analyzed, would be this. When Jesus was in the world, he had a body of flesh and blood, by which his holy spirit manifested itself, and came into relations with other beings. His *voice* uttered truth; his hands wrought miracles; his divine loveliness and peace looked from his eyes; his feet bore him to and fro, doing good. *This* body he has laid aside; but now the church may take its place, — be his voice, hand, feet, eyes; preach, teach, do good. But, to make a body, these members must co-operate, be united, — one spirit baptized into one body.

To Paul, the command meant this union, — all are to partake of the same bread and the same cup, and are to be at one with each other.

If this is what is meant by the Lord's body, — if it be the *church*, — then what is meant by eating and drinking unworthily, not discerning the Lord's body?

We answer, Any way of partaking the Lord's Supper which does not recognize the church as his body, — which shows no reverence for our fellow-Christians as members of Christ, — is to eat unworthily.

Paul's feeling about the Lord's Supper was, that it was a feast of communion of brotherhood. All were to feel that they were one body, and Christ the soul. If they did not feel thus, then they did not discern the Lord's body, — did not see that Christ was in every brother and sister, making each a member of his body, of his flesh and bones. If they showed that they despised or neglected their brothers and sisters, they really were judging themselves, — shutting themselves out from an influx of light and life; not eating and drinking new life and truth, but eating and drinking coldness, doubt, and evil.

So it was with the Corinthians, to whom he is speaking: —

"When ye come together in the church, I hear there are divisions among you; and I partly believe it. When ye come together in *one place*, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper: for, in eating, every one taketh before the other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another drunken. You despise the church of God. Eating unworthily, ye are guilty of the body and blood of Christ. So you eat judgment to yourselves, not discerning the Lord's body."

Where did Paul get the idea of this judgment, for not discerning the body of Jesus? I think, from Jesus himself, in his description of his coming, in Matt. xxiii. Jesus there identifies himself with his church, and says that those who despise and neglect the least of these his brethren despise and neglect him. Paul has the same idea here.

(To be continued.)

MINISTERS' SALARIES.

[This communication is inserted because it is on an important subject, having two sides. This is one side. — Editor.]

Every one knows they are low enough. They compare very poorly with those of smart mechanics and enterprising clerks; and a good minister needs very much more preparation than a good clerk or mechanic. A boy can go directly from the high-school to a shop or office. What study he does after he leaves the high-school makes him a better man, but not a more serviceable tradesman. Now, to be a good minister, after the high-school must come a year or two of preparation for college, then four years of college, then three years of divinity-school. Then he gets about as much salary as if he had been a year or two in business; and he has not the prospect of promotion the business man has. Every one knows that very few ministers are able to support themselves comfortably, and educate their children respectably, without other resources than that of their salaries. Very few ministers can live on their salaries. Either a minister must inherit money, or he must marry money, or he must earn money by other ways than preaching, or he must suffer privations. The divinity student's rule is, "If you don't have money, either marry a rich wife, or don't marry at all." Of course, rules are not customs; but the present system of low salaries seems rather intended to encourage celibacy.

The low-salary system is defended on the ground, that it keeps selfish and mercenary men out of the profession. This would be a sufficient reason if it were a valid one. Is it? Do the low salaries keep out all the selfish and mercenary men? Would ministers be more disinterested if they were paid still less? Would they be perfectly disinterested if they were paid nothing? I had always

believed that low salaries made disinterested ministers, till I found that great generals, like Cæsar and Cromwell, had raised uncommonly disinterested, devoted, and self-sacrificing soldiers by giving them, not low wages, but very high ones. Cromwell got together the best men in England by giving the best pay. It is so in every profession. Good pay brings in good men: mean pay brings in mean men. There is temptation enough for mercenary men to enter the profession as it is, — men who can't earn their living anywhere else, and who, at all events, are glad of the opportunity to get what seems to them a respectable position and a good education cheap. I knew a man who went first to the Meadville, and then to the Andover School, with this very object of using the school-funds. He might have made quite a figure in the profession if he had not unhappily used other funds also, and so got himself expelled. Low salaries do not keep ignorant men of the lower ranks of society from entering the profession with mercenary views: they keep intelligent and cultivated men from entering it with noble views. Whatever the salary of ministers is, there will be mercenary men, and there will be self-sacrificing men. The lower the salaries, the more both these classes of men will be made up of the ignorant, superficial, and weak: the higher these salaries, the more both these classes of men will be made up of the cultivated, the earnest, and the powerful. More than that: I believe, that, out of a hundred cultivated, earnest, and powerful ministers, you will get a much larger per cent of disinterestedness than out of a hundred ignorant, superficial, and weak ministers. It is the strong heads, the deep souls, the large hearts, that make heroes and martyrs. But, it may be said, such men will turn ministers any way, whether they are paid well or not. But they don't. It is a plain fact of political economy, that high wages always attract men of higher character

than low wages do. Young men are much under the influence of their parents, who prefer to have them go where they can get good wages, rather than where they can get poor ones. Not only mercenary parents, but kind and loving parents, like to have their children get good salaries; and educate them for those callings which are best paid. Young men, too, will be most attracted to those professions which other men of their station in life, and powers of mind, prefer. Again: if young men have, for parents or friends, ministers who find it hard to live on their salaries, their first idea of the clerical profession may be a prejudice against it. More ministers' sons would take their fathers' calling if the fathers were better paid. To be sure, a young man may say, "I am called to preach; and I shall preach, whether I get paid for preaching or not." But can we blame the young man who says, "I cannot be sure of my ability to do much more good in the ministry than out of it. I know that the amount of good a man does depends more on his character than on his profession. I owe it to my brothers and sisters, to my intended wife and future children, to take a profession where I can be sure of being able to support them"? Is not this really as Christian a speech as the other? None but a fanatic would think lightly of his duties to the members of his own family, to say nothing of duties of self-culture. Of course, we don't want a bounty for entering the ministry; but we don't want a bounty for keeping out of it.

It should be added, that the minister who is best paid will feel best satisfied with his profession, and most devoted to his work. Raising a man's wages always makes him labor better. Then a minister will work best when most free from pecuniary anxiety. Then, too, a minister ought to be well enough supported to have no need to occupy his time with writing or teaching or speculating, to the injury of his sermons. A minister ought to have a

large enough salary to be able to give all his time to his profession. It is much cheaper for a people to buy all their minister's time than to buy half of it; for it would cost them very little more. Again: the better a minister is paid, the more likely he will be to make his sons ministers, and the better he will educate them if he does. There is no danger but competition will keep ministers' salaries low enough. No misdirected wishes for clerical disinterestedness should keep ministers' salaries down; and, as the conclusion of this argument against the idea that underpaying the ministry makes it disinterested, I would ask, whether this idea be really a reason, or only an excuse.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Aug. 12, 1861. — Present, Messrs. Hedge, Emerson, C. W. Clark, Brigham, Newell, Barrett, Stebbins, Winkley, Sawyer, and Fox.

The Finance Committee, through their Chairman, Geo. B. Emerson, Esq., reported, — that, in considering the subject of raising funds, it had occurred to them, that the Association ought at once to do something for the benefit of the soldiers in the army, and that our parishes should be urged to make special contributions for this purpose. As one method of effecting this important object, they thought a good hymn-book should be circulated; and suggested procuring a work of this kind recently published, if, on examination, it should prove suitable; and that a sufficient number of copies be purchased to supply all those regiments of which the chaplains are Unitarians. After some discussion, in which objection was made to this book in its present form, it was decided to refer the whole subject to a

Committee, who should confer with the publisher, and arrange with him for the use of the plates of such portions of his book as they might select. It was also recommended to the Committee to print the hymns and tunes thus obtained in one of the numbers of the "Monthly Journal," and to issue an edition large enough to supply all the above-mentioned regiments.

The Finance Committee also recommended the publishing and distributing of a volume of selections from the New Testament and Psalms, of a form and size suitable for the use of soldiers. It was the opinion of the Board, however, that this was a work which could be better done by the Bible Society than by the Association; and a Committee was appointed to suggest to the directors of that society the propriety of issuing and circulating such a book.

The Committee further recommended the publication of short addresses, in the tract form, specially adapted to the wants of soldiers, to be written by some of our clergymen.

They offered the following resolution, as expressing their views on the whole subject reported upon; which was unanimously adopted by the Board: —

"Considering the peculiar character of the war in which the country is now engaged, and our relations to those who have enlisted in it, and the unspeakable importance of saving them from forming, during their camp life, the habits of irreverence and profanity, of contempt for the sacredness of truth, of drunkenness and profligacy, and the mean-spirited slothfulness, and hatred of regular and honorable employment, which have so often stigmatized the discharged soldier on his return from war, —

"*Resolved*, That it is our most pressing and sacred duty to do whatever we can to prevent these evils. That we think that very much may be done by furnishing our soldiers with the means of forming, or keeping up, habits of reading the Bible, and other good books suited to their wants; and of singing hymns, and cheerful, innocent, and patriotic songs."

The whole subject of the addresses was then referred to a Committee, who were authorized to invite, in the name of the Board, such gentlemen as they should select to prepare them; and the Finance Committee were instructed to send a circular to all the ministers of the denomination, asking a contribution from their societies to enable the Association to meet the expenses of publishing and distributing the above-mentioned books and tracts.

Rev. Mr. Brigham, Chairman of the Committee on New-England Correspondence, presented a letter from Rev. A. D. Wheeler, D.D., of Brunswick, Me., thanking the Board for their late appropriation, and urging the claims of his society for aid during the next year. He was requested to reply, that the Board fully realizes the importance of the position he occupies, and hopes to be able to grant any aid that may be needed in the future.

Mr. Brigham then presented an application from the society in Warwick for assistance to the amount of $50; and it was voted, that if, on the 1st of January next, the funds will allow, the sum asked for shall be paid.

He also read several letters asking an appropriation of $200 for the society in Lancaster, N.H.; and was authorized to reply, that the financial condition of the Association would, at present, prevent such an appropriation.

The Committee on the Perkins Fund, through their Chairman, Rev. Dr. Hedge, reported in favor of granting, to several applicants in the Cambridge Divinity School, $50 each.

Rev. Dr. Stebbins, Chairman of the Committee on Western Correspondence, presented a letter from Rev. J. S. Brown of Lawrence, Kan., asking the Board to agree to pay to his society, some time during the present year, $200 in addition to the sum already appropriated; thus making the amount of his salary received from the Association, $400. In the present condition of affairs, the Board

did not feel that they would be justified in making such a pledge.

A letter was read from Rev. Dr. Stearns, President of the Meadville Theological School, asking that a portion of the income of the Perkins Fund might be given to the students in that institution, and also asking an appropriation of $100 to aid in sustaining a teacher for their preparatory class. It was voted that $50 from the Perkins Fund be placed in his hands, to use as he should deem best; and that the sum required for the preparatory class be paid at such time as it may be needed, if the funds will allow.

In answer to an application from the society in Keokuk, Io., the Secretary was instructed to send a copy of all the publications of the Association, for the parish library.

INTELLIGENCE.

Rev. WILLIAM G. SCANDLIN, of Grafton, Mass., has been appointed chaplain of the Fifteenth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteers.

Mr. HENRY W. FOOTE, a graduate of the Cambridge Divinity School in the class of 1861, has received a call from the society in Portsmouth, N.H., to become their pastor.

Rev. ARTHUR B. FULLER, of Watertown, Mass., has been appointed chaplain of the Sixteenth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteers.

Rev. ROBERT COLLYER has resigned the charge of the Second Unitarian Society in Chicago, Ill.; having been appointed chaplain-at-large in the camp of our army on the Potomac.

Rev. ROBERT MOORE, a graduate of the Meadville Theological School, has been invited to take charge of the society in Keokuk, Io.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

The Recreations of a Country Parson. Second Series. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1861.

The writer of these papers is an ingenious person, who has written some very good articles for "Fraser's Magazine." These were collected and printed in England and America, and enjoyed a very considerable success. Having written one book from his fulness, he is therefore obliged to write a second volume from his emptiness. Not that the present volume is really empty; but it is very much diluted. This is the inevitable consequence of literary success. A man, for example, writes a good novel out of his heart and life. It has a run. Then he is offered money by the publishers to write more. Being poor, he accepts. Then comes a long list of serial novels, each chapter more wire-drawn than the last; "repetitions wearisome of sense;" babble, which does duty as conversation; small-talk, — *so* small as to indicate nothing, and to lead no whither.

Occasionally, in this volume, we come across a striking thought. There is nothing in it absolutely unreadable. Most of the book flows on easily, gracefully, very intelligibly, and, in fact, *reads itself.* It requires not the slightest effort to read it. You can read it when taking your afternoon nap; or you can pick it up while sailing in a boat, or put it in your pocket when going down to the bowling-alley for a roll before dinner for exercise.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1861.			
July 25.	From a member of the Federal-street Society, Boston, as a donation		$50.00
„ 29.	„	Society in Newburyport, for Monthly Journals	13.00
„ „	„	Society in Kennebunk, Me., for Monthly Journals	23.00
Aug. 3.	„	Rev. Richard Pike's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals	10.00
„ „	„	Second Society, Lowell, for Monthly Journals	10.00
„ 9.	„	Society in Bangor, Me., as their annual contribution	75.00
„ 10.	„	Society in Kalamazoo, Mich., for Monthly Journals	8.00

CANDIDATES FOR SETTLEMENT.

This list will be corrected monthly. Brethren desiring their names entered, or address changed, will please indicate the same to the Secretary of the A. U. A.

The * affixed to the word "Boston" indicates the address, — "Care of American Unitarian Association, Boston."

Preachers.	Address.
John B. Beach	Meadville, Penn.
Samuel C. Beane	Cambridge.
William M. Bicknell	Harrison Square.
John A. Buckingham	Cambridge.
F. L. Capen . . . Care of Barnard Capen, Esq.,	Boston.
William Cushing	Clinton.
J. H. Fowler	Cambridge.
Merritt E. Goddard	Cambridge.
William Ware Hall	Providence, R.I.
Augustus M. Haskell	Cambridge.
James T. Hewes	Cambridge.
M. G. Kimball	Newtonville, Ms.
Lyman Maynard	Milford, Mass.
D. C. O'Daniels	Richmond, N.H.
John Orrell	Sandwich.
George Osgood	Kensington, N.H.
J. M. Peirce	Cambridge.
Thomas H. Pons	Boston.*
James Richardson	Boston.*
Charles Ritter . . . Care of "Christian Inquirer,"	New York.
Charles Robinson	Groton.
Ed. G. Russell	Cambridge.
George W. Stacy	Milford.
Livingston Stone	Cambridgeport.
L. G. Ware	Boston.*
Daniel S. Whitney	Southborough.
William A. Whitwell	Harvard.
J. Henry Wiggin	Boston.*
George A. Williams	Deerfield.
Samuel D. Worden	Lowell.
William C. Wyman	Brooklyn, N.Y.